

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-6534

MARK CORRIGAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

DIANA CARMACK; MS. ATKINS; MS. BOLLOT; DR.
CERVIE; SARGEANT BAILEY; OFFICER BARNES;
HOWARD ADAMS,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

PITT COUNTY; WILSON COUNTY,

Defendants.

No. 00-7611

MARK CORRIGAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

MS. ATKINS; MS. BOLLOT; DR. CERVIE; SARGEANT
BAILEY; OFFICER BARNES; HOWARD ADAMS; DIANA
CARMACK; KATHARINA DEWALD,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

PITT COUNTY; WILSON COUNTY,

Defendants.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. W. Earl Britt, Senior District Judge. (CA-98-667-5-CT-BR)

Submitted: February 16, 2001

Decided: March 19, 2001

Before WILKINS, MOTZ, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Mark Corrigan, Appellant Pro Se. Edwin Constant Bryson, Jr., PATTERSON, DILTNEY, CLAY & BRYSON, Raleigh, North Carolina; JoAnne Keeler Burgdorff, PITT COUNTY LEGAL DEPARTMENT, Greenville, North Carolina; Tommy Willis Jarrett, DEES, SMITH, POWELL, JARRETT, DEES & JONES, Goldsboro, North Carolina; John Dale Madden, SMITH, ANDERSON, BLOUNT, DORSETT, MITCHELL & JERNIGAN, Raleigh, North Carolina; G. Christopher Olson, Christopher W. Jones, WOMBLE, CARLYLE, SANDRIDGE & RICE, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Mark Corrigan appeals the district court's order, which accepted the magistrate judge's recommendation in part and rejected it in part, granting summary judgment in favor of all but one of the Defendants named in Corrigan's action filed under 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 2000), and the order denying without prejudice Corrigan's motion for reconsideration (No. 00-7611). Corrigan also appeals the district court's order denying his motion to amend the complaint and to appoint an expert witness (No. 00-6534). We dismiss the appeals for lack of jurisdiction because the orders are not appealable. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (1994), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (1994); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541 (1949). The orders here appealed are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders.

We dismiss the appeals as interlocutory. We deny the motion to strike Corrigan's informal reply brief and dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED